

In re: Bruton et al.
Serial No. 09/773,811
Filed: January 31, 2001
Page 8

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thorough review of the present application reflected in the Office Actions dated December 8, 2005 and May 26, 2006. In the May 26, 2006 Office Action, all of the pending claims (Claims 1-9 and 14-18) stand rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 5,191,611 to Lang ("Lang"). For the reasons discussed herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these pending rejections in light of various distinctions between the claimed inventions and Lang.

I. Independent Claims 1, 14 and 19

Independent Claims 1, 14 and 19 are directed to, respectively, a method, a system and a computer program product for selectively allowing access to a plurality of resources in a network. Claim 1, which is representative of all three claims, recites:

1. A method for selectively allowing access to a plurality of resources in a network, the method comprising:
 - receiving a request originated from a user of a multi-user system to transmit a message via the multi-user system over the network to one of the plurality of resources, wherein each of the plurality of resources has been assigned to one of a plurality of security zones based on a level of security sensitivity of the resource;
 - identifying a one of the plurality of security zones that is associated with the one of the plurality of resources;
 - determining if the user of the multi-user system is authorized access to the identified one of the plurality of security zones; and
 - forwarding the message from the multi-user system over the network only if it is determined that the user is authorized access to the identified one of the plurality of security zones.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lang, however, does not anticipate the subject matter of Claims 1, 14 and 19 for at least the four (4) independent reasons discussed in the following subsections. The arguments below are presented with respect to Claim 1, but it will be

In re: Bruton et al.
Serial No. 09/773,811
Filed: January 31, 2001
Page 9

understood that due to the correspondence between Claims 1, 14 and 19, each of these arguments apply equally against the rejections of Claims 14 and 19.

A. Lang Does Not Assign Each of a Plurality of Resources to One of a Plurality of Security Zones

The first clause of Claim 1 following the preamble recites "receiving a request originated from a user of a multi-user system to transmit a message via the multi-user system over the network to one of the plurality of resources, wherein each of the plurality of resources has been assigned to one of a plurality of security zones based on a level of security sensitivity of the resource." The Office Action cites to the description of the SCFAX communications system that is described at Col. 9, line 29 through Col. 10, line 59 of Lang, along with the Abstract of Lang, as disclosing this recitation of Claim 1. However, the SCFAX system of Lang does not assign each of a plurality of resources to one of a plurality of security zones as recited in Claim 1. Instead, in the SCFAX system of Lang, a plurality of users may share a recipient fax machine (i.e., fax machine 52 in FIG. 6 of Lang). (See Lang at Col. 9, lines 11-14 and FIG. 6). As explained in Lang, "[w]hile using the SCFAX system, recipients are dynamically assigned on demand or by pre-arranged design, unique logical zones for the secure messages." (Lang at Col. 9, lines 18-21). Thus, with the SCFAX system of Lang, there is a single resource (the recipient fax machine 52) that has a plurality of users (the recipients), where each of these users are assigned to "unique logical zones for the secure messages." Thus, the SCFAX system of Lang takes an entirely different approach than the method of Claim 1 in that it is directed to a situation where a single resource has a plurality of users, and each user is assigned to a logical zone, whereas Claim 1 is directed to a method where there are a plurality of resources, and each resource is assigned to one of a plurality of security zones.

The Abstract of Lang likewise does not disclose assigning each of a plurality of resources to one of a plurality of security zones as recited in Claim 1. Instead, the Abstract discusses dividing a single item (e.g., a storage media like a CD-ROM) into a plurality of logical zones and

In re: Bruton et al.
Serial No. 09/773,811
Filed: January 31, 2001
Page 10

then allowing a plurality of users access to only a portion of the item based upon which zones the user is allowed access. (Lang at Abstract). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited portions of Lang disclose or suggest the first recitation of the body of Claim 1, and that the rejections of Claims 1, 14 and 19 should be withdrawn for this reason.

B. Lang Does Not Disclose Identifying a Security Zone that is Associated with a Resource

The second clause in the body of Claim 1 recites "identifying a one of the plurality of security zones that is associated with the one of the plurality of resources." The Office Action cites to the Abstract, lines 18-26; Col. 2, lines 54-67; Col. 3, lines 1-19; and FIG. 9 of Lang as disclosing such an identification. (See Office Action at 3). In particular, the Office Action states that (1) the "storage media" of Lang comprises the "one of a plurality of resources" of the second clause of Claim 1, and that (2) this storage media may be subdivided into a plurality of logical zones. (Office Action at 3).

However, what Claim 1 recites is "identifying a one of the plurality of security zones" that is associated with the resource at issue. In contrast, in the system of Lang, the identified "resource" (i.e., the storage media) is subdivided into a plurality of security zones, and what is identified is a logical zone that is associated with a particular user as opposed to with the one of the plurality of resources. Accordingly, Lang also does not disclose the second recitation of the body of Claims 1, 14 and 19.

C. Lang Does Not Disclose Forwarding the Message Only If It Is Determined That the User is Authorized Access to the Identified Security Zone

The last clause of Claim 1 recites "forwarding the message from the multi-user system over the network only if it is determined that the user is authorized access to the identified one of the plurality of security zones." The Office Action states that various portions of Lang show that "Lang discloses the communication between the user and storage media start after the

In re: Bruton et al.
Serial No. 09/773,811
Filed: January 31, 2001
Page 11

authentication step is successful." (Office Action at 3-4). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the cited portions of Lang do not disclose "forwarding [a] message from [a] multi-user system over [a] network" as recited in the last clause of Claim 1. Instead, the cited portions merely states that the user is granted access to certain materials that are stored on a storage media such as a CD-ROM, and thus do not disclose either (1) "forwarding [a] message from a multi-user system" or (2) communicating "over [a] network." The failure of Lang to disclose these recitations of Claim 1 provide two additional, independent reasons as to why the rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Thus, for each of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 1, 14 and 19 should be withdrawn.

II. Independent Claim 24

The Office Action states that Claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons that Claim 1 was rejected. (Office Action at 2-4). However, Claim 24 contains different recitations than does Claim 1, and hence Claim 24 cannot properly be rejected without addressing the specific recitations included therein. For example, the Office Action does not explain where Lang discloses "receiving a message over the network from one of the plurality of resources that is addressed to a process running on the multi-user system that is associated with the user" as recited in the first clause in the body of Claim 24. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the embodiments of Lang disclose this recitation of Claim 24, and hence the rejection of Claim 24 should be withdrawn for this reason.

Claim 24 further recites "identifying, from a plurality of security zones, a security zone associated with the one of the plurality of resources." As discussed above in the section addressing the rejections of Claims 1, 14 and 19, the system of Lang does not identify a security zone that is associated with one of a plurality of resources, but instead identifies a logical zone associated with one of a plurality of users of a single resource. As such, Lang also fails to disclose or suggest the second recitation of the body of Claim 24. As is also discussed above,

In re: Bruton et al.
Serial No. 09/773,811
Filed: January 31, 2001
Page 12

Lang likewise fails to disclose forwarding a message only if it is determined that the user is authorized access to the identified security zone. Accordingly, for each of these reasons, the rejection of Claim 24 should be withdrawn.

III. Independent Claim 25

Claim 25 recites.

25. A data processing system for selectively allowing access to a plurality of resources in a network, comprising:

- a data processing device, the data processing device connected to a first network that includes a plurality of networked resources;

- a plurality of workstations that are configured to execute applications on the data processing device;

- a first data structure that specifies at least one security zone from a plurality of security zones that is associated with each of the plurality of networked resources, wherein each of the plurality of security zones represents a distinct level of security sensitivity; and

- a second data structure that specifies the respective security zones to which a plurality of users of the data processing device may have access.

The Office Action states that the "file server" of Lang is equivalent to the "data processing device" of Claim 25, and that the "plurality of logical zones" into which the file server can be divided is equivalent to the "plurality of networked resources" recited in the first clause of the body of Claim 25. The file server of Lang includes a secure storage medium. (Lang at Col. 11, lines 33-37). Lang explains that the file server allows the user to access logical zones on the secure storage medium to which the user has access privilege. (Lang at Col. 11, lines 43-53). Thus, the "logical zones" of Lang clearly are not a plurality of networked resources, but instead refer to directories or the like on a single storage medium. Thus, the cited portions of Lang do not disclose the first clause of the body of Claim 25.

In re: Bruton et al.
Serial No. 09/773,811
Filed: January 31, 2001
Page 13

With respect to the second clause of the body of Claim 25, the Office Action cites to a different embodiment of Lang that involves the use of an SCFAX communication system. (Office Action at 4). Notably, the Office Action states that the SCFAX system comprises the "data processing device" of the second clause of Claim 25, but states that the "file server" of Lang comprises the "data processing device" of the first clause of Claim 25. However, the same data processing device is referred to in the first and second clauses of Claim 25, and hence it cannot be two completely unrelated structures as suggested in the pending rejection. This provides another basis for withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 25.

The Office Action further states that Lang discloses the "first data structure" of Claim 25 in that in Lang "authorizations is request prior access storage media zone based upon role of user." (Office Action at 4). Applicants are not sure that they follow the argument presented in the Office Action, but, in any event, have reviewed the cited portion of Lang and submit that it does not disclose the claimed "first data structure" of Claim 25.

Thus, for each of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 25 should also be withdrawn.

IV. The Dependent Claims

Each of the remaining claims depend from one of Claims 1, 14, 19, 24 or 25, and hence is patentable over Lang for at least the reasons that the claim from which it depends is patentable over Lang. As several bases have already been identified for withdrawal of the rejections of each independent claim, Applicants will not here identify the additional reasons that various of the dependent claims are further patentable over Lang.

In re: Bruton et al.
Serial No. 09/773,811
Filed: January 31, 2001
Page 14

V. Conclusion

For each of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request the present application be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Randal Ayers
Registration No. 40,493

USPTO Customer No. 46589
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401